

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LORRAINE WELLS, et al.,
Plaintiffs,

v.

THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [15-cv-01700-SI](#)

**ORDER RE: FIRST DISCOVERY
DISPUTE**

Re: Dkt. No. 39

Defendants have filed a discovery dispute letter with the Court regarding the scheduling of plaintiffs' depositions. Dkt. No. 39. This is the first discovery dispute in this case.

Defendants ask the Court to order plaintiffs to make themselves available for deposition before the end of the calendar year or else to extend the discovery cut-off, currently set for April 1, 2016. Dkt. Nos. 29, 39. Defendants state that "the parties have met and conferred in good faith" but have been unable to reach a resolution. Dkt. No. 39 at 1. The discovery dispute letter contains defendants' statement but includes no statement from plaintiffs.

The Court's standing order requires that parties meet and confer in person to resolve discovery disputes, and if no resolution is possible, then to file "a concise joint statement of 5 pages or less, stating the nature and status of their dispute." Judge Illston's Standing Order at 1, *available at* <http://www.cand.uscourts.gov/siorders>.

Defendants' discovery dispute letter fails to comply with the Court's standing order for two reasons. First, the Court surmises that the parties have not met and conferred in person, given that the letter fails to so state and that defendants explain they "provided Plaintiffs' counsel two court days to provide a statement on behalf of Plaintiffs, but he did not respond" Dkt. No. 39 at 1. Second, the parties have failed to submit a joint statement.

1 Accordingly, the Court DENIES defendants' motion, without prejudice to refile in
2 accordance with the Court's standing order.

3
4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 Dated: November 6, 2015



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge